

REMARKS

Claims 21, 29, 31, and 33 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 21-32 are currently pending in the application, of which claim 21 is independent. Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. The table below shows where representative support for claim amendments exists in the specification.

Claims	Representative Support
21	Page 17, Lines 7-13; Page 4, Lines 18-21
29, 31	Page 16, Lines 1-19
33	Page 4, Lines 21-22

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 21-30, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,656,238 issued to Rogers. ("Rogers"). Applicant traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration in view of the following reasons. In order to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim. *See* MPEP 2131. Accordingly, in order for claim 21 to be anticipated by Rogers, Rogers must disclose each and every element of

claims 21. Claim 21 has been amended such that there is an “oxidation inhibitor incorporated into said carbon foam.” Applicant respectfully submits that Rogers does not disclose incorporating an oxidation inhibitor into the carbon foam of the insulating core as recited by claim 21. Since Rogers does not teach each and every element of claim 21, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is not anticipated by Rogers. For at least the reasons claim 21 is not anticipated by Rogers, Applicant submits dependent claims 22-32 are not anticipated by Rogers.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 21-34.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers in view of U. S. Patent No. 4,598,007 issued to Kourtides, *et al.* (“Kourtides”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration for at least the following reasons. The combination of Rogers in view of Kourtides does not disclose, teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 21.

Claim 21 as amended such that there is an “oxidation inhibitor incorporated into said carbon foam.” Carbon foam is a porous, open celled material and claim 21 is directed to an oxidation inhibitor being incorporated into this porous, open celled carbon foam material and not as a facesheet applied over a surface the carbon foam. The specification teach this distinction at page 17, lines 7-13.

Kourtides is directed to sandwich like structures with honeycomb cores and fiber reinforced polymeric facesheets. Assuming the combination of Rogers and Kourtides is proper, the combination of Rogers with Kourtides would result in sandwich-like structure with a carbon foam core and fiber reinforced polymeric facesheets. This combination does not result in the combination of features of claim 21. As discussed above, claim 21 is directed to an oxidation inhibitor incorporated into the carbon foam and not as a layer or face sheet applied to the surface of the carbon foam. Since the combination of Rogers in view of Kourtides fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of claim 21, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is not obvious over Rogers in view of Kourtides. Claims 31-33 depend from claim 21 and for the same reasons claim 21 is not obvious over Rogers in view of Kourtides, Applicant submits that claims 31-33 are not obvious over Roger in view of Kourtides. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 31-33.

Extension of Time

A Petition for a three (3)-month extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) is filed herewith extending the period for response through June 6, 2007. It is not believed that any further extensions of time are required other than those in the accompanying Petition. If extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned for under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a). Applicants believe that no further fees for net addition of claims are required at this time. Any fees required for extensions of time and any fees for the net addition of claims are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50331.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this Reply the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Philip D. Lane
Reg. No. 41,140

Date: June 3, 2007

Philip D. Lane
P.O. Box 79318
Charlotte, NC 28271-7063
Tel: 704-301-5007
Fax: 704-843-2318